



State of Wisconsin \ DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Jim Doyle, Governor
Scott Hassett, Secretary

101 S. Webster St.
Box 7921
Madison, Wisconsin 53707-7921
Telephone 608-266-2621
FAX 608-267-3579
TTY 608-267-6897

NR 115 Listening Session Comment Package Summary of Comments

Listening sessions were an opportunity for the public to review and comment on the draft proposals generated together by the Advisory Committee and the Department. Listening sessions were added as an additional step in the traditional rule revision process because the Department recognizes this issue needs special consideration and debate in an open, informative, honest and participatory forum.

Over 850 people attended eight listening sessions that were held around Wisconsin. Comments were accepted on prepared comment sheets, as oral comments at the listening sessions, and as written letters. Comments were accepted until December 31, 2003. Over 1000 comments were submitted regarding the NR 115 Advisory Committee recommendations. To be considered as a comment, the respondent was only required to provide their name.

The 270 comments received on the NR 115 Listening Session Comment Package are summarized below. The sources of the comment sheets are:

- 4 from the Eau Claire listening session;
- 11 from the Grand Chute listening session;
- 17 from the Lake Tomahawk listening session;
- 5 from the Madison listening session;
- 5 from the Onalaska listening session;
- 10 from the Spooner listening session;
- 7 from the Waukesha listening session; and
- 195 were mailed, e-mailed or faxed.

When completing the Comment Sheet, a respondent could select “yes” or “no”. If a respondent selected neither choice, “no opinion” was used. In some instances, respondents indicated a “no” selection for both options, because the respondent felt both options were either “too weak” or “too strong”.

VIII. Filling, Grading, Lagooning, Dredging, Ditching and Excavating

8a. Except for adding a specific provision to allow retaining walls in certain situations, there are no changes proposed to the general standard for permitting filling, grading, lagooning, dredging, ditching and excavating in the shoreland zone. Do you have any concerns about these provisions? Please explain.

We should not allow any excavating within the shoreland zone = 75 feet. VAC should be cleared with only a chainsaw - no heavy equipment. Heavy equipment compacts soils and increases runoff.

- *Jim Cahow, Eau Claire, WI.*

Retaining walls need very clear definitions.

- *Jennifer Wudi.*

I think the retaining wall language should go out for public review too. Our department sees a lot of failing retaining walls - I'd prefer natural vegetation or vegetated riprap. Walls inevitably fail, especially on big fetch lakes.

- *Patrick Goggin, Eagle River, WI.*

I feel the Dept. takes a very stringent, limiting position on dredging as an alternative for lake improvement possibilities.

- *Thomas A. Day, Eagle, WI.*

Why retaining walls at all?

- *Jack Nedland, Barron, WI.*

I feel retaining walls will help stop erosion, but I cannot support filling, grading, lagooning, dredging, ditching, or excavating. Please leave our shorelines as natural as possible and save the waterways for the future.

- *Geraldine Urbonya, Rhineland, WI.*

Relax regulations for area 300-1000 feet off waterfront for wetlands not contiguous with waterfront.

- *Robert Farris, Eagle River, WI.*

No.

- *Connie M. Seefeldt.*

No.

- *Wayne Towne, Keshena, WI.*

No.

- *Daniel N. Rashke, Madison, WI.*

Should handle more through staff review and approved vs. BOA approvals.

- *Lance Gurney.*

if restoring walls are allowed, they should be as visually unobtrusive as possible - cover with vegetation or neutral color

- *Lisa Conley, Oconomowoc, WI.*

Yes, I think the triggering size (10,000 sq. ft.) for a grading permit through the DNR should be reduced to 5,000 sq. ft.

- *Patricia Cicero, Jefferson, WI.*

None

- *Dan & Marge Kazmierczak, Laona, WI.*

The Army Corp of Engineers should be the permitting agency in Federal waters.

- *Larry Wolf, Somerset, WI.*

Too often retaining walls are placed for aesthetics or personal preference, et. Flat fill area behind the wall for more useable lawn area.

- *James Aasen.*

none

- *Eric Ryerson, Oconomowoc, WI.*

none

- *William Dutton, Townsend, WI.*

10,000 sq ft . Permit requirement should be reduced. Also provide for close monitoring of land disturbing activities on greater slopes to shore

- *Beth Bettenhausen, Weyerhauser, WI.*

Need to have regulations and enforcement when there is land disturbance

- *David Rieckmann, New Holstein, WI.*

No.

- *Bob Lorier, Waueksha, WI.*

Retaining walls should not be allowed. Instead setbacks should be increased for structures that might be threatened by erosion.

- *James F. Kerler, Wauwatosa, WI.*

Not at this time.

- *William Pfafflin, LaCrosse, WI.*

Along the Mississippi - we need to riprap to protect our shore and property. Would this be permissible under these changes?

- *Sanford Ilstrud, Trempealeau, WI.*

No, in fact, the retaining wall provision is and has been a part of Sheboygan County's Shoreland-Floodplain Ordinance for years.

- *Matthew Mrochinski, Sheboygan, WI.*

Retaining walls should be allowed only after other methods of control have been attempted and documented. Wildlife ramps and 100% screening should be required

- *Rick Bjodstrup.*

50 acres and over 1/4 mi of frontage. White pines up to 50in diameter consistent with property. I would prefer a proposal that allowed filling and preserving the remaining.

- *Bill Liebert, Rhineland, WI.*

No concerns.

- *Peter J. Van Opens, Oconomowoc, WI.*

Question on dredging. New development in marsh area - all lots meet all the laws - one day they have the marsh and then suddenly they have beaches and areas to pull in boats. In one case I believe (no proof) dredging caused the spread of milfoil.

- *Donald G. Stein, Brookfield, WI.*

Are retaining walls allowed only after erosion has taken place, I would think it would be better to allow retaining walls to prevent eroding before it happens.

- *Howard Bestul, Iola, WI.*

Originally when NR115 and NR116 was created with respect to FILLING it restricted any fill that would cause an increase in the height of a Regional Flood greater than 0.1 (1/10th of a foot) It now states greater than 0.01 (1/100 of a foot which must be a printing error.

- *John M. Stier, Trempealeau, WI.*

No.

- *Henry E. Edmunds II, Cedarburg, WI.*

Add the exemptions section shoreland enhancement projects designed by a County Land and Water Conservation Department. These projects often qualify for state cost-sharing and are required to follow strict guidelines.

- *St. Croix County Planning and Zoning Committee.*

No.

- *WCCA Southeast District.*

There should be requirements for erosion control and stormwater management.

- *Marquette County Zoning, Montello, WI.*

These are not adequate. Why allow additional problem structures to be built? Other conditions ought to be severe enough so as to be incentive enough not to build. Contribute 50% of the cost of building their new home to a conservation organization?

- *Joan Elias, Saxon, WI.*

No

- *Bill Schultz, Palatine, IL.*

These rule provisions should provide more guidance as to acceptable filling and grading activities within shorelands. Best management practices for stormwater management and construction site erosion control should be mandatory. Project review as a conditional use, currently the predominant method of project review, has been largely pro forma and has not resulted in adequate scrutiny of projects. Most contractors and property owners are willing to perform to a higher standard if goals and instructions are clear and cost is not prohibitive. Set the bar higher on this issue for both resource protection and administrative efficiency reasons.

- *Susan Tesarik, Madison, WI.*

No

- *Joseph R. Fittipardi, Amery, WI.*

Use common sense.

- *Norb Morack, Hortonville, WI.*

Retaining walls not needed for erosion control should not be.

- *Mark Schumacher, Wautoma, WI.*

No

- *Norman Dupke, Park Falls, WI.*

No.

- *David W. Sautebon.*

No

- *Robert W. Fay, Kenosha, WI.*

No

- *David Wendt.*

No

- *Robert B. Williams, Hazelhurst, WI.*

Each of the provisions should be handled on a case-by-case basis and rejected or accepted as common sense dictates.

- *Lloyd Wykhuis, Mayville, WI.*

No

- *Door Co. Planning, Sturgeon Bay, WI.*

If restoration efforts are applied, erosion should not be a problem. Retaining walls should not be allowed in shoreland setback.

- *Nancy M. Christel.*

I am saddened that there are situations that require retaining walls and hope that they are rare. Please enforce the other standards with STIFF FINES.

- *June Schmaal, Arbor Vitae, WI.*

Not thrilled about allowing retaining walls. What is the standard going to be to prove a retaining wall is the only option? A statement from an engineer that a proper slope cannot be created and stabilized?

- *Michael Weber, LaCrosse, WI.*

The Army Corps of Engineers should be the permitting agency in Federal waters.

- *Larry & Liz Wolf, Somerset, WI.*

If it is not a runoff or erosion problem, eliminate the restrictions.

- *Gerald Zimpelmann, Eagle River, WI.*

Retaining walls are ugly & necessary in steep terrain. This is the area that will mostly affect the lake. Your guidance is helpful.

- *Diane Higgins.*

There are other effective practices that are better suited to controlling erosion (rock gabions, biologs, plantings, e-mat, etc.). Also, sometimes the erosion is caused by human activity (ie. Vegetation removal).
- *Ruth M. King, Sarona, WI.*

Retaining walls are not desirable, so the "certain situations" would need to be defined very well.
- *Bryan Pierce, Eagle River, WI.*

No
- *Bemd Rehm, Madison, WI.*

10,000 sq. ft. permit threshold for grading is much too generous. This area should be reduced by at least half!
- *Paul Dearlove, Cambridge, WI.*

Save the wetlands & shorelines.
- *James Knuth, Presque Isle, WI.*

The only concern I have is that people can get away with building a retaining wall designed primarily to create a beach along the shore.
- *Jane Dreis, Hudson, WI.*

No change. But if allowed, walls should only be allowed if natural methods would cause erosion.
- *Dianne M. Moore, New Berlin, WI.*

Keep such restrictions on these activities as strong as possible!
- *Stephen R. Anderson, Hartford, WI.*

Wetland protection is vital as is maintaining the maximum flow of runoff waters to them.
- *Herbert Buettner, White Lake, WI.*

These provisions should not be allowed. My concern is that in all of these "lake rules" there is not adequate and effective enforcement of the rules.
- *Jim McLaughlin, Webster, WI.*

Be restrictive on retaining walls, do not allow expansion of where boat shelters can be built.
- *Mark Beilfuss, New London, WI.*

Best is no change. But OK if only natural erosion control methods won't work.
- *William F. Moore, New Berlin, WI.*

No. Although I do think there needs to be more thought given to "retaining walls." Most do not look natural, and detract from what a natural lake should look like.
- *Rob Rothe, Appleton, WI.*

No change is good. Retaining walls should only be allowed if natural methods would not be possible or would not work.
- *Edna Moore, New Berlin, WI.*

This section is fine; however, NRCS standards should apply and be referred to.
- *NWDZZA.*

Do you, in general, support:

8b. permitting retaining walls within the shoreland setback area (within 75 feet of the OHWM) if necessary to control on-going erosion that other nonstructural methods cannot address, and if the primary buffer is preserved or restored?

	Yes	No	No Opinion
Total	72 %	10 %	17 %
Eau Claire	75 %	25 %	0 %
Grand Chute	73 %	9 %	18 %
Lake Tomahawk	65 %	24 %	12 %
Madison	80 %	0 %	20 %
Onalaska	60 %	20 %	20 %
Spooner	30 %	0 %	70 %
Waukesha	86 %	0 %	14 %
Mailed/Faxed/E-mailed	75 %	10 %	15 %

8c. Do you think it is adequate to require the primary buffer to preserved or restored, or should additional conditions be placed on the construction of retaining walls if they are allowed to be built at less than the required OHWM setback, such as height, size, color, screening or other considerations? Please explain.

If determined by agency not property owner.

- *Fred Anderson.*

This should not be allowed unless all other BMP options have been exhausted! We should emphasize that retaining walls are seldom acceptable. If used they should be as short as possible with subdued colors and hidden by shrubs and other vegetation.

- *Jim Cahow, Eau Claire, WI.*

Supports 8b only with written request explaining future of other strategies.

Adequate if actually enforced.

- *R. T. Kruger.*

Yes, the owner should have to prove retaining walls are needed.

- *Jennifer Wudi.*

Secondary buffer restored/enhanced as well.

- *Patrick Goggin, Eagle River, WI.*

Height - walls that are high may limit wildlife and cause safety issues.

- *Nancy Welch, Elkhorn, WI.*

Height - walls that are high may limit wildlife and cause safety issues.

- *Nicholas Sigmund, Elkhorn, WI.*

Yes, It must be kept as natural as possible. Walls can be camouflaged.

- *Michael Peterson.*

Natural materials - rock, wood. Encourage riprap and vegetation.

- *Sandy Heidel, Onalaska, WI.*

But, materials used need to be more standardized. Right now, we have all sorts of structures and materials. My suggestion is sandstone to make it look more natural.

- *Mark Vollendorf, Altoona, WI.*

I believe all feasible options should be exhausted before allowing retaining walls.

- *Terry Cummings, Rhineland, WI.*

Limit grade on which structures are placed behind 75' buffer to ~20% or close.

- *David Hoffman, Stoddard, WI.*

Retaining walls shouldn't be necessary if there was a suitable building site to begin with. They should not be visible from the lake.

- *Ron Krueger, Crandon, WI.*

Keep the walls as natural as possible and not a concrete jungle.

- *Geraldine Urbonya, Rhineland, WI.*

Enforcement and monitoring. Other conditions will be necessary to prevent explosion of retaining walls.

- *Jeff Niese, Tomahawk, WI.*

Muted color and screening with native vegetation.

- *S. S. Gillum, Eagle River, WI.*

No retaining walls should be allowed in most situations.

- *Sandy Engel, Woodruff, WI.*

Additional conditions, yes. But my expertise is very inadequate to make advice on retaining walls.

- *John McComb, Lodi, WI.*

Need additional conditions such as those listed, but maybe some additional mitigation somewhere else for destroying the natural buffer that was originally there to prevent erosion in the first place.

- *Mary Gansberg.*

Retaining walls should be kept as low and unobtrusive as possible.

- *Jackie Calhoun Smith, Appleton, WI.*

They should only be as large as necessary and built in a way that they blend in.

- *Diane S. Mandler, Appleton, WI.*

Retaining walls destroy the near shore zone and littoral zone. Why do you want to allow that?

- *Henry Katz, Manitowoc, WI.*

Retaining walls shouldn't be allowed in shoreland setback area.

- *John LeFebvre, Porterfield, WI.*

Retaining walls frequently do not do the job and when they deteriorate the original problem is worse.

- *Rae Renee Towne, Keshena, WI.*

Never allow vertical retaining walls.

- *Greg Cleereman, Marinette, WI.*

Yes.

- *Wayne Towne, Keshena, WI.*

Primary buffer must be restored and color should blend in with the environment.

- *Dick Hollar, Comstock, WI.*

No - and buffer should not be restored.

- *Richard A. Howarth, Jr., Elkhorn, WI.*

Retaining walls only allowed if necessary! Require neutral color, screening, and limit height.

- *Charles C. Druckney.*

Yes.

- *Daniel N. Rashke, Madison, WI.*

Retaining walls should blend in with the natural environment as much as possible. Certainly height, size, color, etc. should be bare minimum to prevent erosion.

- *Mary F. Witt, Hayward, WI.*

I think it is adequate to require primary buffer be preserved.

- *Dave Nusbaum, Brookfield, WI.*

Yes.

- *Francis H. Odgen, River Falls, WI.*

1. Type of material used - natural (not man-made). 2. Height of walls.

- *Lance Gurney.*

This proposal would result in abuses only imagined at this time.

- *Jerome Viste, Sturgeon Bay, WI.*

see above

- *Lisa Conley, Oconomowoc, WI.*

Primary buffer is adequate.

- *Kevin Stange, Sheboygan, WI.*

Height: no more than 6" above natural slope of land, color: to blend into vegetation.

- *Russel C. Evans, Waukesha, WI.*

There might be a problem with defining "on-going" erosion.

- *Patricia Cicero, Jefferson, WI.*

It is adequate. No need for additional conditions.

- *Sterling F. Strause, Wild Rose, WI.*

Set height allowed.

- *Michael A. Schindler, Phelps, WI.*

Yes

- *Dan & Marge Kazmierczak, Laona, WI.*

Supporting this only if there are minimum restrictions.

- *Scott Schulz, Germantown, WI.*

Whenever possible, retaining walls should be built from natural materials native to the area and permanent. Other materials should blend in or be screened with vines, shrubs, etc.

- *Larry Wolf, Somerset, WI.*

Additional conditions; including an assessment by DNR stating the necessity for retaining walls.

- *James Aasen.*

retaining wall height is a concern

- *Eric Ryerson, Oconomowoc, WI.*

see 7q

- *Roger Peterson, Sturgeon Bay, WI.*

yes on all

- *William Dutton, Townsend, WI.*

yes, they should blend with the environment

- *J. Burriss, Neenah, WI.*

no

- *Bruce Frajford, Stone Lake, WI.*

I think much more can and should be done with retaining walls and the issuance of permits for them on an equitable basis.

- *Mark Enneper, Kiel, WI.*

Height should be limited to max necessary, but no more than 6 or 8'; earth tone colors should be required; and landscape screening should be required for walls taller than 4'.

- *Nancy Anderson, Waukesha, WI.*

height and material restrictions

- *Beth Bettenhausen, Weyerhaeuser, WI.*

All of these items should be considered.

- *Robert H. Sokolowicz, Greendale, WI.*

conditions for scenic beauty relative to surrounding area

- *David Rieckmann, New Holstein, WI.*

Case by case basis.

- *Bob Lorier, Waukesha, WI.*

Added aesthetic requirements should definitely be imposed to prevent tacky or ostentatious walls.

- *James F. Kerler, Wauwatosa, WI.*

No conditions on retaining walls.

- *William Pfafflin, LaCrosse, WI.*

Yes they should not stand out from surrounding neighborhood surroundings.

- *Sanford Ilstrud, Trempealeau, WI.*

Additional conditions - especially height, color, screening

- *Kay Ellis, Waupaca, WI.*

Height - walls that are high may limit wildlife and cause safety issues.

- *Debora Grube, Elkhorn, WI.*

Minimum standards as to what constitutes preservation/restoration of the primary buffer must be established. Retaining walls should be screened with vegetation and constructed of materials employing earth-toned colors.

- *Matthew Mrochinski, Sheboygan, WI.*

Yes.

- *Denny Thompson, Harshaw, WI.*

Proof must be required for any retaining wall in primary buffer zone.

- *Robert Hagge, Hazelhurst, WI.*

Yes, if water quality is improved along with wildlife habitat. Natural materials screened with vegetation.

- *Thomas A. Clark, Manitowoc, WI.*

Unobtrusive, natural materials, vegetation if it affects water quality.

- *Judith M. Rollin, Manitowoc, WI.*

Retaining walls should be allowed only after other methods of control have been attempted and documented. Wildlife ramps and 100% screening should be required

- *Rick Bjodstrup.*

Local established consideration.

- *Bill Liebert, Rhineland, WI.*

When mitigation is enacted - yes conditions on "natural" materials should be enacted. Lannon stone and natural boulder rather than concrete with exposed flat surface or wood.

- *Tom and Sue Runyon, Oconomowoc, WI.*

Again, define "retaining wall" - most of us on Lake Michigan have installed wave barriers for protection from high water, which are usually buried during low water.

- *Jim TeSelle, Grafton, WI.*

No additional restrictions.

- *Peter J. Van Opens, Oconomowoc, WI.*

All of the above.

- *Patricia Haukohl, Brookfield, WI.*

In urban situation I think neighbors must agree on how a retaining wall will look. The neighbors know a retaining is approved but must sign off on your design. Within reason.

- *Donald G. Stein, Brookfield, WI.*

Yes additional conditions should be put in place.

- *Jim Kairis, Racine.*

Height and size may vary on each location and needs to be flexible to meet the needs and conditions.

Color and screening should be a requirement.

- *Howard Bestul, Iola, WI.*

For this to be applicable to the existing NR 115 for Lake Michigan the retaining wall may have to be placed offshore. The question on its own has no relevance to Lake Michigan.

- *Henry E. Edmunds II, Cedarburg, WI.*

If there is on-going erosion that can only be controlled by a retaining wall, something tells me unacceptable development is going on this land (eg too steep, lawn to the shore, etc). No retaining walls - maybe this land needs to revert to the state for safekeeping.

- *Sharon Duerkop, Appleton.*

Yes, conditions such as required plantings in front of the retaining wall to break up the wall appearance, wall color, wall height, and natural looking walls are encouraged.

- *St. Croix County Planning and Zoning Committee.*

The retaining wall should be screened and a height restriction on the wall should be required (2 - 3 feet.)

This should be done by conditional use permit. If the wall is within the primary buffer it may be more appropriate to restore the entire primary buffer. The primary buffer should not have to be completely restored in this case.

- *WCCA Southeast District.*

Determining when necessary could create a conflict.

- *Marquette County Zoning, Montello, WI.*

Include ramps every xx feet so wildlife can get up and down.

- *Joan Elias, Saxon, WI.*

Most retaining walls used to create patios, shouldn't allow grade alterations.

- *Gerald T. Peterson, Elkhorn, WI.*

Retaining walls should be allowed, maybe, only in situations where there is significant and on-going erosion problems, such as slumping of steep slopes. Wasn't NR 328 supposed to have language to take care of providing adequate shoreland erosion guidance? If so, is it redundant to put this type of language in NR115? Couldn't just a reference be made to NR 328? If allowed, and I'm not sure that it's necessary here, there are structures in the shoreland area and should be limited in their necessity, size, color, and screening.

- *Susan Tesarik, Madison, WI.*

Retaining walls should be as low as possible, natural materials used - stone, etc.

- *Dixie Lee Chermack, Bernes, WI.*

No

- *Joseph R. Fittipardi, Amery, WI.*

Additional conditions are vital.

- *Thomas K. Nelson, Elkhardt Lake, WI.*

OK

- *Alan Schwoegler, Madison, WI.*

Not adequate.

- *M. Davison, Crandon, WI.*

I think it is adequate to require that the primary buffer be preserved or restored.

- *Craig Wissink, Spooner, WI.*

Use common sense.

- *Norb Morack, Hortonville, WI.*

Only if land conservation verifies.

- *Mark Schumacher, Wautoma, WI.*

Prefer boulders, sloping stabilizing rip rap v. retaining WALL.

- *Ruth Jaeger, Rhinelander, WI.*

Please, this is locale issues & how it effects neighbors.

- *Ken Kornburger, Green Lake, WI.*

Yes, height, size, color & screening should be required. I would be particularly concerned about height & color.

- *Phyllis A. Utley, Sturgeon Bay, WI.*

Must have materials, height, etc. issues addressed.

- *Matthew Bremer, Baraboo, WI.*

If WDNR is going to allow riprap and especially large dimension stone riprap immediately below the OHWM without any protection of the primary buffer, I see no reason that retaining walls should not be allowed nor should they require additional primary buffer restoration.

- *David W. Sautebon.*

Size should be the minimal size necessary to control erosion.

- *Richard Minkley, Wauwatosa, WI.*

Yes, they should be required to execute a conservation easement of the primary buffer.

- *Robert W. Fay, Kenosha, WI.*

Yes

- *David Wendt.*

All of the above should have requirements.

- *David Hansen.*

There must be limits on height, size, color, and screening.

- *John Molinaro.*

Adequate

- *Lloyd Wykhuis, Mayville, WI.*

No - already trying to control problem - don't agree with retaining walls for aesthetics.

- *Door Co. Planning, Sturgeon Bay, WI.*

Retaining walls should not be allowed. This is not a solution, it is a bandage approach.

- *Nancy M. Christel.*

Keep everything as natural as possible. Limit size and height and screen with plantings.

- *June Schmaal, Arbor Vitae, WI.*

If we are going to allow retaining walls then we need standards to make them as inconspicuous as possible. Any wall exceeding 4-ft. in height should be engineered. A deed restriction should be recorded that states "when the wall fails the property owner is required to remove or repair it."

- *Michael Weber, LaCrosse, WI.*

Whenever possible, retaining walls should be built from natural materials native to the area and permanent. Other materials should blend in or be screened with vines, shrubs, etc.

- *Larry & Liz Wolf, Somerset, WI.*

No! Stay out of the "pretty" business!

- *Gerald Zimpelmann, Eagle River, WI.*

Color and screening should be regulated to lessen aesthetic impact. Height should be regulated as a function of the pre-wall ground slope to prevent the construction of unnecessarily tall walls for the purpose of creating useable yard space.

- *Green Lake County Land Use Planning & Zoning, Green Lake, WI.*

Yes - minimize visual impact.

- *Jane Schneider, Wauwatosa, WI.*

Safety & future use require many tall retaining walls to be rebuilt periodically. Drainage should be addressed if it is near a neighbor - but not by DNR. Local government is better because they can inspect.

- *Diane Higgins.*

Setback 50 ft., height less 3 ft., color earth tone, screening planting in front of retaining wall.

- *Jeffrey W. Henneman, Waupaca, WI.*

I have a hard time believing that retaining walls would be "necessary" and that other erosion control methods couldn't be used - in fact, the need for most retaining walls should be eliminated if development is done properly.

- *Bryan Pierce, Eagle River, WI.*

Primary buffer protection and restoration (if applicable) is paramount. Screening should be required as a mitigation measure and color should be as inconspicuous as possible within setting.

- *Bemd Rehm, Madison, WI.*

Definite restrictions if allowed. It should look as natural as possible.

- *James Knuth, Presque Isle, WI.*

No conditions on retaining walls.

- *Rosalie Schnick.*

Additional conditions should be as low as practical, extend only as far as necessary to control erosion and be a natural color and screened from the water with vegetation (of height and density to adequately screen)

- *Nancy Russell, Lake Geneva, WI.*

Not a bad idea. There are people out there who would create a flamingo pink retaining wall. There is no accounting for taste. So, natural colors, would be a good suggestion. I'm not informed enough to comment further.

- *Jane Dreis, Hudson, WI.*

Above plus natural color and small and unobtrusive.

- *Dianne M. Moore, New Berlin, WI.*

Place additional conditions on these, with the health of the lake ecosystem the primary concern of such restrictions.

- *Stephen R. Anderson, Hartford, WI.*

These are local issues & those of the immediate neighbors.

- *Kay Kornburger, Green Lake, WI.*

No additional restrictions.

- *Jim Bassett, Winneconne, WI.*

Conditions are necessary to accomplish their purpose and to minimize adverse visual effects.

- *Herbert Buettner, White Lake, WI.*

Require a fee-paid site plan and on-site review and permit approval; with penalty of money fine and restoration as deemed necessary due to noncompliance.

- *Jim McLaughlin, Webster, WI.*

Mitigation to sea walls if allowed is desirable.

- *Mark Beilfuss, New London, WI.*

Smallest possible size, natural color, screened.

- *William F. Moore, New Berlin, WI.*

Maintain no construction in primary buffer.

- *William Ave'Lallemant, Lac du Flambeau, WI.*

Please write additional conditions! And don't allow the ugly block walls that are starting to appear on our northern lakes. Natural rock, placed by hand if necessary looks the best.

- *Rob Rothe, Appleton, WI.*

Requirements to protect scenic quality would be preferred.

- *Cheryl Nenn. Friends of Milwaukee's Rivers, Milwaukee, WI.*

8a above plus minimum size possible & natural color with all possible natural screening.

- *Edna Moore, New Berlin, WI.*

Need additional standards but allow the counties to establish the conditions or standards.

- *Langlade Co. Water & Land Use Planning Committee, Antigo, WI.*

I would like to see the circled portion in "8b" above allowed without requiring change to the buffer area.
Requiring restoring a buffer area is a separate issue.

- *Mike Kosmak, Markeson, WI.*